

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated August 4, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 13-15, 17-23 and 27-37 are pending. Claim 22 is hereby amended. Claims 27-37 have previously been withdrawn; claims 1-12, 16, and 24-26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and the Abstract has been amended.. Accordingly, claims 13-15 and 17-23 remain currently pending for examination in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Abstract is objected to. Applicants have amended the Abstract as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 13-15 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,912,920 to Kubota (hereinafter "Kubota") in view of Melles-Griot Optics Catalog (Optics Guide 5) (hereinafter "Melles-Griot") and U.S. Patent No. 4,624,537 to Hanssen et al. (hereinafter "Hanssen").

The rejection of claims 13-15 and 17-23 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 13-15 and 17-23 are allowable over the cited references because there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Kubota, Melles and Hanssen. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. (MPEP 2143.01 (III)).

Here, Kubota teaches a vehicle headlight, which uses a light source, a parabolic reflector, and a transparent laminated plate having transparent sheets (Abstract). Kubota teaches that "the principal object [of the invention] is to provide a polarized light illumination device which can utilize more effectively light from the light source without absorbing light." (Col. 1, lines 16-20, emphasis added). Toward this end, Kubota teaches that "the transmitted light

[through the polarizer] comprising the light component (Pp) is utilized for the narrow angle forward illumination of the headlight while the light of component (Ps) illuminates the environs over a wide angle so that it does not directly illuminate the automobile coming from the opposite direction. Thus there is entirely no loss of the projected light from the headlight.” (Col. 3, lines 35-42, emphasis added). Accordingly, Kubota teaches a headlight in which all of the light, including both states (Pp and Ps) of polarization produced by the transparent laminated plate, is to be projected, and none is to be absorbed.

In contrast, Melles-Griot teaches a lens holder, whereby “[t]he body is black chrome coated to reduce scatter and stray reflections.” Further, the Examiner states that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the material of the polarizer holder of Kubota having an absorptivity almost equal to 100%, as taught by the Melles-Griot catalog.”(Office Action, page 4).

Applicants respectively assert that this feature of Melles-Griot is contradictory to the objective of Kubota. This is because Kubota expressly states that its objective is for no light to be lost from either state of polarization. Both polarization components are preserved and used by the vehicle headlight. This objective would be undermined by a polarizer holder with a highly absorbing material, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the teaching of Kubota and Melles-Griot.

Also, Hanssen teaches a microscope including a motor-displaceable mechanical stage, X and Y axes displacement drivers for driving the motor-displaceable mechanical stage and a track ball for delivering control signals to the X and Y axes displacement drivers. Hanssen is not related as polarizer system. Further, the Examiner states that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of the modified Kubota reference, as taught by Hanssen, in order to easily adjust the positioning of the polarization elements as needed.” (Office Action, page 5). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the teaching of Kubota and Hanssen.

In addition, the present invention teaches a polarizer system for treating an alignment layer of a substrate for liquid crystal display device comprising; a light source for generating a light; a plurality of quartz substrate parts each quartz substrate part including one or more quartz

substrates; a polarizer holder supporting said plurality of quartz substrate parts, wherein the polarizer holder includes a material having an optical absorptivity of almost 100%, and wherein the polarizer holder absorbs light reflected by the plurality of quartz substrate parts; a first moving control part moving the plurality of quartz substrate parts in the X axis direction; a second moving control part moving the plurality of quartz substrate parts in the Y axis direction; and means for directing said light onto said plurality of quartz substrate parts.” But, the combination of Kubota, Melles-Griot and Hanssen fails to teach or suggest a polarizer system for treating an alignment layer of a substrate for liquid crystal display device as recited in claim 22.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 13-15 and 17-23.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 09/618,165

Docket No.: 8733.039.20 US

Amendment dated Nov. 3, 2008

Reply to final Office Action dated Aug. 4, 2008

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: November 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant